off their connection with the ground, but made them appear as if tottering in the air. Where the pedestal occupied a greater space between the soffit and the stylobate, less remained for the column, which became shorter, thinner, weaker, *requiring instead of affording support*; its apparent weakness exceeding its real debility, like an appendage not wrought for the building, but borrowed from some smaller structure, and only carried to the requisite height by the aid of materials which did not belong to it. As they became weaker, like the limbs of an unhealthy child, they were stretched to a greater distance from each other, and were no longer capable of bearing an entablature diminished to their own proportions. In order fully to confirm their inutility, they were not made to carry any such, but of an architrave directly supported by the wall itself (a continuation of that wall indeed, under a different denomination), such projections or knots as did not exceed their own diameter, and appeared fitter for the purpose of steadying the useless pillar, than the pillar for that of carrying an unmeaning entablature. The effect produced was that of a second capital, mimicking the first; confusing its form and destroying its appearance; causing as great a multiplication of breaks and angles and of clumsy mouldings, as arises from the equally useless pedestal underneath." In other cases, column and entablature were included by independent arches, "so that the column carrying the entablature, but the entablature carrying nothing, the former only appeared for the purpose of supporting the latter, and the latter for that of tying together the former." The climax of the mal-appropriation of the column was its isolated employment as a high perch for a statue, while all its details and decorations retained a reference to the heavy entablature, as their origin and justification, and the main condition of their beauty. The misapplication of the column of course brought on a proportionate degradation of its form. Vague and arbitrary notions of symmetry, simplicity, variety, &c., took the place of a steady and intelligible reference to the powers of gravitation and support. The Doric shaft owed its effect of enormous and active might chiefly to the flutes, and to the fact that it sprang at once from the ground, without any preparations of base or independent plinth. The "Roman Doric" was a dead cylindrical lump, resting on a plinth surmounted by a base consisting of one great roll-moulding, that looked as if it had been formed from a mass of yielding matter by the pressure of the inanimate shaft. The Greek shaft, whether Doric or Ionic, never expressed its own weight, but confined itself to foretelling and manifestly preparing to meet that of the entablature. The capital of the column was the first point at which sufferance from weight was declared. Here the Doric and "Attic Ionic" architects showed surprising skill and sensibility. Curves of great active force — always conic sections — were chosen for the outlines of the great feature of the Doric capital, the "ovolo." For these curves, the Romans substituted the insignificant quarter-circle, which expressed just nothing at all but want of skill to draw any other curve, or, at best, a childish and vain attempt to improve the shaft by "harmonizing" it with the semicircular forms of the new construction. The Greek Ionic capital is a powerful, though perhaps unjustifiable, representation of elasticity. The Ionic volutes would be formed by the pressure of the entablature upon a coach-spring, of which the two bars should be equal in length but unequal in strength, the lower bar being much more powerful in the middle than the upper bar, whose elasticity should be uniform. It seems to us that this suggestion of self-formation was intended to be conveyed by the Ionic capital: if it was not so, we do not know how this member can be defended against Mr. Ruskin's charge of being an "exceedingly base" invention; but if it was so, we cannot speak with any high praise of an expression, in stone, of a quality which it is manifestly impossible that stone itself should ever exhibit. How far the subtlety and quick perception of the Greeks may have pierced the obscurity which this inconsistency produces, in the Ionic capital, or how far the *abstract* effect, which was conferred upon form by the system of polychrome painting, may have concealed that inconsistency, we cannot estimate. But taking the Greek Ionic capital at the worst, as being obscure and inconsistent in meaning, it is vastly better than the Roman Ionic, of which the no-meaning was very distinctly pronounced by the character of its curves. In Greek Doric the abacus had a very important office as the member which separated the two great classes of supporting and supported members. It was a simple square-cut slab, and afforded the point of perfect repose, around which all other details grouped themselves in harmonious relation. The senseless Roman architects turned this beautiful figure into an actively supporting member, by crowning it with a moulding expressive of resistance to weight: but probably these persons had not the merit of intending even as much as this by their alteration; for they seem to have considered the Greek mouldings as arbitrary decorations, which might be applied, without distinction, wherever it seemed desirable, to ornament a fillet, or to terminate a blank space with a pretty edging. When we arrive at the entablature, we find similar faults from the same causes. The Greek triglyph, in the frieze, represented the notched ends of the beams which stretched from architrave to architrave, and formed the foundation of the flat roof. The roof became arched, and these triglyphs lost their constructive significance, and ought to have ceased altogether. But they were surreptitiously retained; and, not only so, but they were made to seem more dependent than ever upon their departed meaning, by being placed rigidly over the centre of every shaft; whereas the Greeks partially violated the constructive meaning of the triglyphs in favour of a higher artistic value, by binding the corner of the frieze with a pair of them, and so shifting them and those that were next to them out of their right constructive position over the supporting shafts. Equally little regard to the original sense was paid to the other details of the entablature, and the entablature itself lost its organic character by the loss of the originally distinct nature of its three members — the architrave, frieze, and cornice. The Romans failed most remarkably in the point about which they made the greatest ostentation of science, namely, proportion. They shackled their practice by an elaborate code of arbitrary rules, none of which were ever dreamt of by the Greeks, whom they professed to follow; and, at the same time, they forgot the living centre of reference, which was the source of the exquisite Doric proportional system, namely, the simple mass of the architrave,* the *relative* breadth of which was increased or diminished in proportion to the degree of power to be expressed. "But," writes Mr. Hope, "of all the parts borrowed from Grecian architecture, that which came to be applied as the way most different from, most inconsistent with, its nature and distinction in the original, was the fastigium, the part which we call the pediment. That pediment, which was only the termination of a roof, slanting both ways from its central line or spine, of which, throughout its whole length from end to end," (except in hypæthral temples,) "the continuity was never broken, which was never seen in Grecian buildings except on the straight line at the summit, and the gable formed by the extremity of the roof, in Roman architecture frequently appeared as if cut off from all that belonged to it, and grew out of, or was stuck under, the entablature which it should have surmounted, against the upright wall, over a door, a window, or a niche, even, as in the Temple of Balbeck, placed within a projecting portico—a situation in which it could not be useful even to carry off the wet. Instead of a single, large, and majestic pediment, naturally and magnificently terminating the building, several rows were sometimes seen of these small and inappropriate triangles; and to complete the inconsistency, they were rendered as unnatural in form as in situation. They were sometimes rounded, sometimes broken, sometimes squeezed within others of larger, sometimes strung round others of smaller dimensions." The grossness of the Roman taste was, however, even more conspicuous in their decorative "improvements" and inventions than in their misunderstanding of what had been invented before them. They "improved" the Doric shaft by substituting for the exquisite horizontal neck-channels a projecting band or "astragal," which, instead of proving the sufficiency of the shaft to do its work, by taking away from its power where power was most needed, seemed to indicate that the shaft required strengthening at that point; and in their stupid devotion to mechanical symmetry they made the slanting and horizontal cornices of the Doric order all alike, by introducing the dentils — representative of rafter ends—into the former, where rafters could not possibly occur. The Romans never seemed to have caught a glimpse of the possibility of inventing a system of decoration appropriate to their splendid discovery of the mechanical virtues of the arch. Where it interfered with Greek forms, they absolutely hid it away, instead of decorating and boasting of it; the horizontal entablature in Roman architecture being sometimes nothing more than a *mask* to a mass of *arched* construction.

* "See *North British Review* for February 1850, pp. 334, 335. We must refer those of our readers, who wish to make a study of the subject in hand to the above Number of this Review: it is not possible fully to describe the extent of the Roman abuse of Greek forms without repeating much that was there said. Whenever, in the present article, a principle in Greek architecture is assumed, it is because it has already been proved in the foregoing essay."

SITTINGS IN CHURCHES.

At the last meeting of the Lincolnshire Architectural Society, a paper was read by the Rev. F. P. Lowe, on open seats. The following is a portion of it:—

If we go into a church which, by some wonderful stroke of good fortune, has preserved its ancient arrangement tolerably intact, we shall find that

> "The floor
> Of nave and aisle in unpretending guise
> Is occupied by oaken benches ranged
> In seemly rows."

Every seat, except those placed against the north and south walls of the chancel, was turned towards the east: a wide alley is invariably left down the centre of the nave, leading straight up from the west door to the chancel. Similar passages (connected with the main one by a cross passage from the north to the south door) give access to the seats in the aisles, either running just within the piers, or, if the aisle is wide, or there be a chantry chapel at the east end of it, it is treated in the same way as the nave with a passage up the centre. The transepts were not seated at all, but were generally occupied by altars ranged along the east wall. If the church we have been imagining be either in Norfolk or Suffolk, we shall most likely find the ends of the benches terminating in richly-carved poppy heads, of rather a large size, compared with the total height of the standard: if it be a church in the west of England, Somersetshire, Devonshire, or Cornwall, most likely the bench ends will be square-headed, and the sides very elaborately carved. If we examine the construction of these seats, we shall find the standards all morticed into stout oak sills, which are placed on the floor, which, in most cases, is continued underneath them. Where a boarded floor has been introduced, it is always boarding fastened to the sills, not connected with the floor of the church. The fashion I have seen adopted in many modern restorations of building up a platform and fixing the seats upon it, has no precedent in ancient times. I believe, in many cases, the seats had no other floor than the bare earth, covered with rushes, as we know was the case in some domestic dwellings, and that boards were introduced afterwards in accordance with a more refined state of feeling. There is generally a narrow flat board at the back of the seat, for the persons who sit in the seat behind to kneel at: this is invariably placed flat, not sloping, as modern bookboards are often incorrectly made. If, again, we

For a comprehensive guide on PDF Compression and OCR visit ThePaperlessOffice.org